



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,840

06/22/2006

Devin Dressman

001107.00581

6445

22907

7590

10/29/2010

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

WOOLWINE, SAMUEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/29/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/562,840	Applicant(s) DRESSMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE	Art Unit 1637	

All Participants:

(1) SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE.

(2) SARAH A. KAGAN.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Rejections under section 103 of the Office action mailed 09/15/2010.

Claims discussed:
n/a

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Samuel Woolwine/
Primary Examiner

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:45 am

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Parties discussed MPEP 715.02(I) regarding the swearing behind one of a combination of references, specifically: "Where a claim has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Reference A in view of Reference B, with the effective date of secondary Reference B being earlier than that of Reference A, the applicant can rely on the teachings of Reference B to show that the differences between what is shown in his or her 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art prior to the date of Reference A. However, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must still establish possession of the claimed invention, not just what Reference A shows, if Reference A does not teach the basic inventive concept."

In this case, it appears to the Examiner that the "basic inventive concept" is performing PCR in an emulsion with beads, primers, other PCR reagents and sample nucleic acid to form a population of beads, each bead having multiple copies of a single species of nucleic acid sequence immobilized thereon (which may be the same as or different from the nucleic acid species immobilized on other beads), and analyzing the sequence of the immobilized nucleic acids. In this respect the affidavit submitted 03/23/3009 shows this concept. Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 715.02(I), the Examiner vacates the previous Office action (mailed 09/15/2010) and withdraws the section 103 rejections made therein. A new Office action will be issued in response to Applicant's last reply filed 09/08/2010..